



TITLE:

Introduction: The Articulation-Sphere Approach to Humanitarian Assistance to East African Pastoralists

AUTHOR(S):

KONAKA, Shinya

CITATION:

KONAKA, Shinya. Introduction: The Articulation-Sphere Approach to Humanitarian Assistance to East African Pastoralists. African study monographs. Supplementary issue 2017, 53: 1-17

ISSUE DATE:

2017-03

URL:

<https://doi.org/10.14989/218918>

RIGHT:

INTRODUCTION: THE ARTICULATION-SPHERE APPROACH TO HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO EAST AFRICAN PASTORALISTS

Shinya KONAKA

School of International Relations, University of Shizuoka

ABSTRACT This article introduces and provides an overview of the main theme of this volume and explores the possibility of localizing humanitarian assistance frameworks with regard to East African pastoralists. It is incorrect to depict the livelihood of East African pastoralists without considering humanitarian assistance and its secondary effects. However, too little attention has been paid to the issue. Many studies have revealed that humanitarian assistance is not necessarily a neutral, impartial, and apolitical act. In addition, cultural diversity has not yet been examined thoroughly in humanitarian research, although humanitarian assistance is not an acultural practice. To respond to cultural diversity and current reality of the transformation, I introduce the “articulation-sphere approach,” which focuses on the intermediate realm between the local and the universal. This approach may not only show us an initial sign of the self-help efforts of the victims themselves after disasters, but also opens up the possibility of localizing universal humanitarian assistance frameworks from below. With this approach, I reexamine the personal, temporal, and spatial frameworks of humanitarian assistance in East African pastoral societies. Subsequently, I also give an overview of the articulation of the primary frameworks of humanitarian assistance and East African pastoralism. Lastly, I show the perspective and significance of the articulation sphere approach.

Key Words: East Africa; Pastoralist; Humanitarian assistance; Articulation; Localization.

INTRODUCTION

This paper introduces and provides an overview of the main theme of this volume. This volume explores possibilities for the localization of humanitarian assistance frameworks with regard to East African pastoralists. It is based on the outcomes of the international workshop held in Shizuoka, Japan from December 10 to 11, 2015 under the title “Reconsidering the Basic Human Needs for the East African Pastoralists: Towards the Localization of Humanitarian Assistance.”

About five million pastoralists, divided into different ethnic groups, live in the vast, dry region of East Africa. Where these pastoralists have been encapsulated in peripheral parts of Kenya, Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda, they share systems of production, society, and culture that are based on livestock keeping, and they form a cultural sphere that appears to transcend national borders.

The Ethiopian famine of 1983 alerted the world to the suffering of pastoral societies in East Africa. Since then, international organizations have continuously provided emergency humanitarian assistance, mainly in the form of food aid during times of famine. A report (IPCC, 2007) predicted that, because of the effects

of global climate change, droughts in dry areas could be prolonged. For this reason, there is great concern that the situation in East African pastoral society could become much worse.

As Somalia and Sudan illustrate, civil war has been a frequent occurrence in East African countries since the end of the Cold War. As a consequence, a substantial amount of modern weapons (mainly assault rifles) have been introduced into pastoral society, making conflicts larger and more severe. Many pastoralists live at the periphery of the nation-state in areas that the state finds difficult to rule effectively. There are also politically unstable areas. As a result of conflict, many pastoralists have become refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs), and some receive assistance from international organizations.

Recently, the African Union (AU) and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA) drafted a special policy framework to address this issue (AU, 2010). As a result, humanitarian assistance is now almost the norm.

People and organizations that provide humanitarian assistance generally emphasize factors that universally apply to all humankind. Many researchers have already pointed out that humanitarian assistance is not necessarily a value-neutral, impartial, and apolitical phenomenon. The need to respect the diversity of an area's culture can sometimes become an issue that affects the provision of humanitarian assistance. This problem can become acute for practitioners who work with distinct cultural groups, such as East African pastoral societies.

In our project, titled "Localization project for new frameworks of humanitarian assistance in East African pastoral societies (JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. 25257005)," researchers who have studied pastoral societies in East Africa propose to investigate the area in which humanitarian assistance and pastoral culture interact (the articulation sphere) and to explore their negotiations through fieldwork, carrying out research on location.

In Japan, a group of researchers in area studies and ecological anthropology has been researching East African pastoral society since 1961. The project team is made up of 10 researchers from various disciplines; all have been researching Africa for a long time.

The ultimate aim of this project is to localize the framework of humanitarian assistance, which is premised on human universality, within the reality of pastoral society, from the viewpoint of comprehensive area studies undertaken by an interdisciplinary team of specialists. This approach will enable us to uncover the latent potential of the area, ultimately helping these communities find a way toward their desired future.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

I. Core Principles of Humanitarian Assistance

There is no single accepted definition of humanitarianism; however, humanitarianism in the Western tradition is often associated with Christian traditions of

altruism and charity (Minn, 2007). The roots of modern humanitarianism as a Western concept can be traced back to the 18th century, which established the modern secular declaration of human rights as the touchstone of new state constitutions (Nichols, 1987). Through the two world wars, humanitarianism developed into an international humanitarian regime, both as a moral imperative and as institutional settings (NOHA, 1998), as embodied by the Red Cross Society, League of Nations, and United Nations.

Although many principles of humanitarian assistance are listed, above all, neutrality, impartiality, and independence form the core of the humanitarian principles that have been admitted internationally (ICRC, 1996; MSF, n.d.). Thus, those principles constitute the basic presupposition of humanitarian assistance. These principles enable the alleviation of human suffering universally without discrimination or taking sides.

II. Humanitarian Assistance and Politics

However, since the end of the Cold War and especially since the unprecedented conflicts in Somalia, Bosnia, and Rwanda, the realities of humanitarian assistance activities based on the ideal principles above have become the target of criticism by many authors (Predergast, 1996; de Waal, 1997; Terry, 2002; Polman, 2008). Although the points of critique have varied, one of the main points is the fact that the economic and political resources of humanitarian aid may affect conflicts. As Anderson (1999: 39) pointed out, aid resources are often stolen by fighters and used to support armies and buy weapons, and aid affects markets by reinforcing either the war economy or the peace economy. As a result, the consequence of humanitarian assistance contradicts the principles of “impartiality” and “neutrality.”

Similar phenomena have been observed in other terms, such as “military humanitarianism” (Prendergast, 1996), “humanitarian impunity” (de Waal, 1997), “refugee-warrior” (Terry, 2002), and “humanitarian paradox” (Terry, 2002). Around 2000, it had become widely recognized that humanitarian assistance might engender negative consequences that are far from its idealistic principles, especially in terms of “neutrality” and “impartiality.” It is now evident that humanitarian assistance, in its field reality, never goes without politics, although political correctness has been noticed since 1972, when Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders) parted from the Red Cross (Brauman, 1996).

III. Standardization of Humanitarian Assistance

In response to the many critiques of humanitarian assistance, humanitarian organizations collaborated to initiate project aims to overcome such criticism around 2000. The Local Capacities for Peace Project (LCPP) by the Collaborative for Development Action (CDA) is an example (Anderson, 1999). Humanitarian organizations also have collaborated to formulate standards, criteria, guidance notes, and charters to maintain the quality of humanitarian assistance. We can list many examples: the “Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian

Response” by the Sphere Project (2011), the “Core Humanitarian Standard” by the CHS Alliance (2014), the “Evaluation of Humanitarian Action” by ALNAP (2013), and the “Minimum Standards for Education” by INEE (2012). It is beyond my capacities to evaluate whether these efforts adequately address the critiques that have been leveled. I would only like to stress here that the important point is not to deny and all humanitarian activities in a negative fashion, but to seek possibilities to improve and reconstitute them in a positive fashion. As Terry (2002: 245) put it, “Humanitarian action will never attain perfection: rather than aiming for a first-best world, we must aim for a second-best world and adjust to that accordingly.”

CULTURAL DIVERSITIES AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

Based on these arguments, I add one more item to the agenda for the improvement and recreation of humanitarian assistance in response to the aforementioned controversies. It is the issue of “cultural diversity and humanitarian assistance.” In humanitarian discourses, authors always stress having an equal attitude toward all humankind worldwide, regardless of nationality, race, or religious beliefs. For example, the Red Cross lists “universality” as their seventh principle (ICRC, 1996: 17).

I mostly agree with the view that equality and universality are crucially important for humanitarian assistance and do not mean to criticize the values of these principles, *per se*. The problem is that these principles easily turn to the mere “homogenization” of victims. As Malkki (1996: 388) pointed out, in the discourses and actions of humanitarianism, human beings have been ideally recognized and treated as single, unified, standardized, homogeneous, depersonalized, and universal beings, in spite of the immense range of cultural and personal backgrounds.

This homogenized recognition has also been reflected in a number of “standards” issued by the above-mentioned humanitarian organizations. Although some standards have given consideration to cultural diversity to a certain extent (e.g. Sphere Project, 2011; CHS Alliance, 2014; INEE, 2012), most standards have literally “standardized” cultural diversity under the premise of the universality of humankind.

In contrast, facing reality in the field, humanitarian assistance is never an “acultural” nor “human universal” issue. People living in the third and fourth worlds, who constitute the majority of those vulnerable to humanitarian crises, are mostly living in the periphery of national and international systems. Hence, they are obliged to live in substantial dependency on their distinctive cultures, since there is no alternative knowledge resource for them. Accordingly, most humanitarian operations are launched in the context of a huge cultural gap. “Givers and recipients of aid may share concern with the elimination of the immediate effects of crises, but they do so from different cultural perspectives” (NOHA, 1998: 2). “Local circumstances alter the way humanitarian action is perceived, filtering it through a cultural, religious, or political lens” (Abu-Sada, 2012: 34).

One more important factor is the “cultural right” that accounts for an indis-

pensable part of human rights, as UN agencies have repeatedly declared (Universal Declaration of Human Rights [1949], UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity [2001], Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage [2003], and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples [2007]). I stress here that victims of humanitarian crises should not be excluded from consideration regarding cultural rights.

Nevertheless, only a few attempts have been made regarding the issue of the relationship between humanitarian assistance and cultural diversity (Lensu, 2003; Abu-Sada, 2012). The difficulty for anthropologists in making an effective contribution to development and humanitarian work has been pointed out (Benadusi & Riccio, 2011). Exploration of the relationship between humanitarian assistance and cultural diversity with field evidence is now required in order to reconsider and recreate the humanitarian assistance frameworks (In this paper, “humanitarian assistance framework” means certain presumptions of humanitarian assistance including principles, standards, and criteria).

The result will make it possible to localize humanitarian assistance frameworks in regard to the diversity of cultural backgrounds. Our effort should be directed toward the “diversification” of the humanitarian frameworks, as well as their “standardization.” This opens up new possibilities to coordinate humanitarian assistance and cultural diversity more smoothly and effectively.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND EAST AFRICAN PASTORALISTS

Based on the argument presented thus far, I reconsider the possibilities for the localization of humanitarian assistance in East African pastoral societies. In the aftermath of incessant droughts, famines, civil wars, low-intensity conflicts and forced migrations, East African pastoral societies have become among the semi-permanent recipients of humanitarian assistance and accompanying development projects. From the colonial period to the present, countless crises have been caused by natural and manmade disasters in the area: forced migration from the conservation zone, recurrent food insecurity in the Horn of Africa, conflicts and both interstate and intrastate wars in Somalia, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Northern Uganda, terrorist and bandit attacks in Northern Kenya, displacement by the large-scale development project in Ethiopia, and so on.

I will briefly mention the causes of disaster, since we do not have adequate space here for a fuller discussion. The causes vary greatly between each case and multiple causes are intertwined intricately in most cases. Under these conditions, I point out the “marginalization” of pastoralists from the colonial and postcolonial state as one of the greatest causes of all (cf. Horowitz & Little, 1987; Spencer, 1998; Fratkin, 2001; Markakis, 2004; Pavanello, 2009; Catley et al., 2013). In other words, East African pastoralists have been under the threat of “structural violence” (Galtung, 1969; Farmer, 2004). Hence, we should not attribute the causes to the environmental and cultural factors of pastoralists easily and carelessly (de Waal, 1997; Krätli, 2001; Krätli & Dyer, 2006).

Certainly, humanitarian crises are here to stay unless we succeed in eliminat-

ing the causes of the disasters themselves. However, in reality, signs of drastic improvement in marginalization are rarely found, at least at this stage. This means that humanitarian assistance is still necessary for pastoralists for the time being. It is also worth noting that humanitarian assistance efforts have had secondary impacts on the livelihood of East African pastoralists.

Therefore, it is inappropriate and incorrect to depict the livelihood of East African pastoralists without considering humanitarian assistance and its secondary effects. It is doubtless that, at the least, some proportion of them are “living with” humanitarian assistance.

However, too little attention has been paid to the issue of “humanitarian assistance and pastoralists” in East Africa, while we can list many precedent academic works on the issue of “development and pastoralists” (Galaty et al, 1981; Galaty & Saltzman, 1981; Raikes, 1981; Sandford, 1983; Evengelou, 1984; Scoones, 1995; Fratkin, 1991, 1997; Majok & Schwabe, 1996; Catley et al., 2013). Therefore, it is necessary for us to start exploring the relationship between humanitarian assistance and pastoralists. I expect that the results will make it possible to localize the frameworks of humanitarian assistance for East African pastoralists.

ARTICULATION-SPHERE APPROACH

I. Outline of the Articulation-Sphere Approach

Based on the argument so far, I examine an approach to exploring the relationship between humanitarian assistance and pastoralists. One option is to explore the relationship between humanitarian assistance and pastoral cultures. However, we should be deliberate in dealing with the concept of culture. Many cultural anthropologists and critics have criticized the view that culture is coherent, timeless, and discrete (Clifford, 1988; Fabian, 1983; Abu-Lughod, 1991; Appadurai, 1996; Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). Many researchers have also criticized the mystification and stereotypical images of East African pastoralists (Livingstone, 1977; Johnson, 1981; Knowles & Collett, 1989; Galaty & Bonte, 1991; Dyson-Hudson, 1991; Fratkin et al., 1994; Hodgson, 2000; Kratz & Gordon, 2002; Straight, 2009). These researchers have pointed out that East African pastoralists have been inaccurately depicted as warlike, aggressive, conservative, irrational, and patriarchal. Hence, we must be cautious to avoid “a body of myths, misconceptions, simplifications [sic], and overgeneralizations about pastoralists that pervade our popular and academic vision of Africa” (Galaty & Bonte, 1991).

Therefore, we do not intend to opt to explore the relationship between humanitarian assistance and these distorted images of pastoral cultures. Instead, we focus here on the “articulation sphere” between the universal and the local. This means the intermediate sphere between the universal and local spheres. The articulation sphere is not a synonym for a pure, traditional, coherent, static, discrete, and homogeneous culture. Rather, the articulation sphere entails the hybridity, discontinuity, incoherency, dynamism, indiscreetness, and heterogeneity of culture. Strictly speaking, the term “cultural diversity,” not culture as coherent, timeless, and dis-

crete, should indicate the diversity of this articulation sphere in this paper.

Meanwhile, I do not agree with the complete denial of the concept of culture, at least in the context of humanitarian assistance. In the discourses of humanitarian assistance, the complete denial of the notion of culture may lead to the disregard of the cultural rights of victims. I propose the articulation-sphere approach not for the abandonment but for the renovation of the concept of culture.

I have reported elsewhere upon two ethnographic cases of the articulation sphere of East African pastoralists. One case concerns the transformation of the pastoral economy after the establishment of a livestock market (Konaka, 1997, 2001, 2006). This case shows an articulation between the market economy and subsistence economy. The other is a case of the utilization of waste material (Konaka, 2007). This case shows the hybrid articulation between the local material culture of pastoralists and universal commodities, including relief material from international aid agencies.

II. Articulation-Sphere Approach to Humanitarian Assistance

If we adopt the articulation sphere approach to humanitarian assistance, what we should focus upon is not the typical images of the traditional culture of the victims that was presumed to exist before disaster struck, but what victims have constructed after disasters by their own efforts. However, in studies of both humanitarian assistance and pastoral cultures, researchers have paid little attention to the articulation sphere because it has been regarded as something false, counterfeit, inauthentic, insignificant, trifling, and trivial both to humanitarian assistance and to their original culture.

Even if the articulation sphere is trivial, it deserves greater attention because it may show us an initial sign of the self-help efforts of the victims themselves after disasters. It may not coincide with the typical images of traditional culture; it implicates another new pathway toward their future livelihood and development. As Harrell-Bond (1986: 366) once asserted, "Imposing aid can never be successful." The articulation sphere approach may make it possible to find clues about reconsidering and recreating humanitarian assistance frameworks from below.

ARTICULATION-SPHERE APPROACH TO HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORKS

I. Minimum Standard and Pastoral Humanity: Personal Frameworks

Regarding the localization of humanitarian assistance frameworks for East African pastoralists, I give an overview of several agendas with three frameworks: personal, temporal, and spatial. The first involves the minimum standard and pastoral humanity related to personal frameworks.

The main trend in development studies in the past century has shifted from the early economic development theory to the sustainable development theory and the human security theory. The focus has been shifted from optimistic economic

growth to the maintenance of minimum standards for vulnerable people and their environments.

Most of the ongoing humanitarian assistance efforts and accompanying development projects targeting East African pastoralists presuppose minimum standards of life, such as human rights, human security, basic human needs, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), universal primary education, and primary health care. This is not an astonishing fact because East African pastoralists have not been assured of even these minimum standards. I note here again that the Sphere Project and other aforementioned similar and related projects have prescribed the minimum standards. There is no doubt that not one of these efforts go without the notion of human dignity. However, in East African pastoral societies, human dignity is closely interrelated to interaction with livestock, as has been clarified by classic ethnography (Evans-Pritchard, 1940). Therefore, the articulation sphere between universal minimum standards and pastoral human dignity must be explored.

The articulation-sphere approach begs a number of accompanying questions: What are the minimum standards and the basic human needs of East African pastoralists? Is the universal framework of humanitarian assistance applicable to East African pastoralists without any modifications? What is the definition of human dignity for East African pastoralists? Can frameworks of humanitarian assistance respect the human dignity of pastoralists? How can East African pastoralists reconstruct a minimum livelihood when facing humanitarian crises, with or without livestock? How are vulnerable persons in terms of gender and age treated among pastoral communities at the time of humanitarian crises? How can we narrow the gap between humanitarian assistance and the current realities of pastoralists?

II. Phases and Cycles of Humanitarian Crises: Time Frameworks

The second item concerns the phases and cycles of humanitarian crises, or, in other words, the time frameworks. In studies of emergency management, the disaster management cycle is composed of four phases: response, recovery, mitigation, and preparedness (NEHRP, 2009; Haddow et al., 2011). On the other hand, researchers on East African pastoralists have mainly argued about the recovery process of the herd from serious drought (Dahl & Hjort, 1976; McCabe, 1987; Little & Leslie, 1999).

From the viewpoint of our approach, we have to question the articulation sphere between the disaster management cycle of humanitarian agencies and the herd recovery cycle of local pastoralists. However, preceding studies have mainly questioned the process by which minimum livestock keepers have recovered their herds to the standard size. However, the more important question is the “missing link” between victims who have lost all of their livestock and minimum livestock keepers. A person who has suffered a complete loss of livestock may seek an alternative livelihood, such as agriculture, honey hunting, petty trading, wage labor, and so on (Johnson & Anderson, 1988; Fratkin et al., 2012). However, the micro recovery process from completely losing one’s livestock to becoming a minimum livestock owner or acquiring another alternative livelihood has not yet

been clarified precisely. Although it might sound paradoxical to the researchers of pastoralists, non-herd-owner victims are more important from the humanitarian viewpoint than are herd owners, since they are the most vulnerable people in pastoral communities. In short, we have to redirect our attention from minimum livestock owners to those suffering complete livestock loss.

From this viewpoint, the following questions arise. How can those suffering a complete loss of livestock survive? How can those suffering a complete loss of livestock recover their livelihoods? How can those suffering a complete loss of livestock choose between keeping livestock and an alternative livelihood? Is an alternative livelihood effective in reconstructing their livelihood? What kind of humanitarian assistance is effective for the livestock losers and keepers? Can humanitarian assistance manage to coordinate between life with livestock and that without?

These questions also lead us to the intermediate realm between humanitarian studies and development studies. The so-called “humanitarian-development gap” (Branczik, 2004; Gabaudan, 2012; Moore, 2010; Kay-Fowlow, 2012; Hinds, 2015) is among the most noteworthy agenda items in related disciplines. As Gabaudan (2012) recognized, “bridging the gap between emergency humanitarian aid and long-term development aid is essential to help people survive disasters and get back on the path to self reliance and dignity.” This direction coincides with our articulation-sphere approach in the respect of the attention given to signs of self-reliance and dignity. If we succeed in finding signs of self-help efforts with the articulation-sphere approach, this will contribute to bridging the humanitarian-development gap.

III. Nomadism and Displacement: Space Frameworks

The third item on the agenda is the “displacement-nomadism dichotomy” that concerns spatial frameworks. The sedentarization issue has occupied major portions of the studies on East African pastoral societies for the past several decades. As Roth and Fratkin (2005: 17–18) have pointed out, “the shift to sedentism by East African pastoralists increased dramatically in the late 20th century as a result of sharp economic, political, demographic, and environmental changes.” Certainly, I agree with the view that the impact of sedentarization has been one of the most important agenda items of East African nomadic pastoralists for the past several decades.

If we assume a purely nomadic style of residential pattern with high mobility, displacement would not have brought about many problems. Mobility would be an automatic solution to displacement. The pure nomadic model suggests that only sedentarization, the ban of movement, matters for a purely nomadic people, not displacement.

However, from the viewpoint of our articulation-sphere approach, we must consider the further transformations of pastoralists after their sedentarization. A considerable proportion of nomads has already shifted from pure nomadism to a semi-nomadic or sedentary residential pattern. Therefore, pastoralists have come to build and keep social networks and social capital around their residential areas.

Pastoralists have also come to regard schools, the livestock market, and retail shops as important components of their residences in addition to pasture and water resources (Sun, 2005).

Therefore, for semi-nomadic and sedentary pastoralists, displacement matters more than sedentarization. As a consequence of displacement, pastoralists might lose a considerable amount of their social networks and capital, educational opportunities, income resources, and market accessibility, all of which ensure food security.

In spite of the serious damage to their livelihood, the displacement issue among pastoralists has been unreasonably neglected. As IDMC (2014: 16) put it, “the distinction between voluntary forms of mobility and displacement is difficult to draw and not always clear, particularly in situations of drought and other processes that encroach slowly upon nomadic living space.” From the point of view of outsiders to pastoral communities, displacement has always been confused with nomadism. The old stereotypical images of pure nomads have concealed the displacement issue.

From this viewpoint, the following attendant questions arise. What kind of damage do pastoral refugees and IDPs suffer after displacement? How do pastoral refugees and IDPs lose/get access to the market and education after displacement? How can pastoral refugees and IDPs reconstruct their settlements? What is the relationship between nomadic camps and shelters?

In studies on displacement and forced migration, several universal models of resettlement have been proposed, such as the Scudder-Colson model (Scudder & Colson, 1982) and the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model (Cernea & McDowell, 2000). The articulation-sphere approach proposes to explore the intermediate space between those universal models and the residential realities of pastoral refugees and IDPs.

PRIMARY FRAMEWORKS OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

Lastly, I provide an overview of some agenda items that concern the subdivisions of humanitarian assistance frameworks from our viewpoint of the articulation-sphere approach.

1) Non-food Items and Material Culture

The articulation between non-food items of humanitarian assistance and the material culture of pastoralists should be questioned. What are the most necessary core non-food items for displaced East African pastoralists? Are non-food relief items relevant to the material culture of East African pastoralists?

2) Food Security and Resilience

The articulation between the food relief of humanitarian assistance and the food habits of pastoralists should be questioned in terms of food security and resilience. This issue is also related to the climate changes of the area. Is the relief food relevant to the food preferences of East African pastoralists based on their

livestock products? How has relief food affected the household economies, and how has it been situated with the redistribution economies of East African pastoralists?

3) Primary Health Care Systems and Medical Pluralism

The articulation between the healthcare systems of humanitarian assistance and the health matters of pastoralists should be questioned from the viewpoint of medical pluralism (Hardon et al., 2001). What happens to the minds and bodies of pastoralists if they are detached from their holistic pastoral systems by displacement? How can we coordinate the primary health care systems of humanitarian assistance with the local health care system of East African pastoralists?

4) Formal and Informal Education

The articulation between the formal and informal education of pastoralists should be questioned. How have pastoralists responded to the sudden loss of formal education after the evacuation? Can informal educational efforts by pastoralists, such as voluntary private school, complement formal education in responding to the new life course expectations of their children?

5) Comparative Approach: African Herders, Farmers, and Hunter-gatherers

All efforts to localize universal humanitarian assistance by responding to the special needs for pastoralists should be reviewed from broader perspectives. To relativize our argument on pastoralists so far, we need comparative perspectives with African farmers and hunter-gatherers who similarly live at the marginal areas of nation states. This comparison makes it possible not only to position the distinctive features of East African pastoralists on the spectrum of various subsistence strategies in Africa, but also to extract their precise special needs.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I. Inner-Shelter Model of Humanitarian Assistance

Following the narrative approach to development studies (Roe, 1991; Swift, 1996), Krätli (2013) points out that pastoralism and drylands are usually found in a peripheral position in global narratives of development (see also Ferguson, 1990). “Most definitions make reference to what they are not rather than what they are, for example, the lack of integration with crops; the scarcity of natural resources; the lack of possibility for economic growth” (Krätli, 2013: 2). Krätli and Schareika (2010: 606) called these “narratives of deficit.” It is evident that humanitarian assistance forms a substantial part of this global narrative of development as well as global climate change, food insecurity, and so on. He also suggests that the winning policy narratives contain “a politically neutral concern.” As this review has argued, the same thing can be said of the relationship between humanitarian assistance and political neutrality.

The ethnographic evidence in this volume reveals what is going on beneath

the global narratives of humanitarian assistance. As the articles in this volume suggest, what we found in the field of East African pastoralists is a huge gap between the narratives of humanitarian assistance and the daily practices of pastoralists who have suffered from humanitarian crises but have created other deviations based on self-effort. This leads us to reconsider the notion of protection. The “narrative of protection” presupposes certain stereotypical images: victims are weak, powerless, helpless, vulnerable, dreary, and dependent. According to the narrative, the powerlessness of the victims justifies the intervention of empowerment from outside of the local community. However, what we found in this volume is the fact that the protection of victims cannot be limited to outside channels. We found a sphere of “invisible protection” at the community level: both within and between communities.

Invisible protection at the community level forms the “inner shelter,” contrasting with the visible protection from outside of the communities. The protection of inner shelter is not as clearly visible as relief food, tents, or medical kits. The inner shelter is ephemeral, fragile, flexible, but resilient. It is not a synonym for the traditional culture nor the social structure, but a transformed variant of them, as our articulation sphere approach suggests. It has been overlooked from description both by ethnographers and aid workers. It must be discovered because it is not visible unless we strain our eyes to see. This direction coincides with a focus on the promotion of “pastoralist-to-pastoralist links” (Roe et al., 1998: 15–16).

It should be noted that what I propose here is not that we should expel every instance of humanitarian assistance and intervention from the community. We have witnessed humanitarian assistance efforts from outside that have saved countless lives of pastoralists during humanitarian crises. It is not realistic to imagine a completely independent model of humanitarian assistance within the community. What we propose concerning humanitarian assistance to the East African pastoralists is ensuring the complementarity of the inner and the outer shelter. The articulation-sphere approach intends to facilitate the coordination between them.

II. Beyond “Western Universalism”

The questions and agenda items listed here have mostly remained unquestioned, both by researchers and by humanitarian practitioners. The articulation-sphere approach will make it possible to explore them. This will open up possibilities for revision of the humanitarian standards with cooperation between researchers and practitioners.

We expect that the results of this volume will contribute to the reforming and restructuring of the frameworks of humanitarian assistance to East African pastoralists and create new policy frameworks that consider the current realities of pastoralists through use of the articulation-sphere approach.

Borrowing terminology from Scott (1998), Catley et al. (2013) showed us a significant contrast between two types of viewpoint: “seen like a development agency” and “seen like a pastoralist.” I entirely agree with their focus on the plural pathways that are shaped by pastoral innovation, ingenuity, and aspiration. In addition, following the contrast, what I propose, using the articulation-sphere

approach, is “seeing like both a development agency and a pastoralist” concurrently. It is only when seen from both sides that the articulation-sphere approach will show us new possibilities for recreating humanitarian assistance frameworks.

I close this introduction with the words of Donini (2012: 191). He suggested that the currently dominant universalism is merely “Western universalism” that is rooted at the base of humanitarianism, humanitarian assistance, colonialism, and imperialism, and that it has brought myriads of conflicts and clashes to the rest of the world. In place of that, Donini proposes a sort of “universal universalism.” However, thus far, there remains no consensus and no clear picture of what such a framework might look like.

I hope this localization project on humanitarian assistance frameworks can serve as one of the concrete steps toward “universal universalism.” I am convinced that it is quite significant to take a step toward “universal universalism” in the study of East African pastoralists, who have been most marginalized in the world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS This publication was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grants 25257005. I would like to thank all of the informants in the East African pastoral societies who collaborated with me. This work was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grants 20401010, 24651275, 25257005, and 16K13305 and Research Funds of the University of Shizuoka. Advice and comments given by participants of the international workshop and the contributors to this volume have been a great help in this introduction. I am particularly grateful for the comments by Dr. Saverio Krätli.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, L. 1991. Writing against culture. In (R. Fox, ed.) *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, pp. 137–162. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Abu-Sada, C. (ed.) 2012. *In the Eyes of Others: How People in Crises Perceive Humanitarian Aid*. Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), Geneva.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP). 2013. *Evaluation of Humanitarian Action*. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- African Union (AU) 2010. *Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities*. Addis Ababa.
- Anderson, M. 1999. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.
- Benadusi, M. & B. Riccio 2011. Introduction. In (M. Benadusi, C. Brambilla & B. Riccio, eds.) *Disasters, Development and Humanitarian Aid: New Challenges for Anthropology*, pp. 7–12. Guaraldi, Rimini.
- Branczik, A. 2004. Humanitarian Aid and Development Assistance. *Beyond Intractability*, February 2004. Online. <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/humanitarian-aid> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Brauman, R. 1996. *Humanitaire le Dilemme, Entretien avec Philippe Petit*. éditions Textuel, Paris.

- Catley, A., J. Lind & I. Scoones (eds.) 2013. *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*. Routledge, London.
- Cerneia, M. & C. McDowell (eds.) 2000. *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- CHS Alliance. 2014. *The Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability*. Groupe URD, Plaisians.
- Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Dahl, G. & A. Hjort 1976. *Having Herds: Pastoral Herd Growth and Household Economy*. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology. University of Stockholm, Stockholm.
- de Waal, A. 1997. *Famine Crimes: Politics and the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*. James Currey, Oxford.
- Donini, A. 2012. Humanitarianism, perceptions, power. In (C. Abu-Sada, ed.) *In the Eyes of Others: How People in Crises Perceive Humanitarian Aid*, pp. 190–199. Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), Geneva.
- Dyson-Hudson, N. 1991. Pastoral production systems and livestock development projects: An East African Perspective. In (M. Cernea ed.) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development, Second Edition*, pp. 219–256, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Evangelou, P. 1984. *Livestock Development in Kenya's Maasailand: Pastoralists' Transition to a Market Economy*. Westview Press, London.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Fabian, J. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Farmer, P. 2004. An anthropology of structural violence. *Current Anthropology*, 45: 305–325.
- Ferguson, J. 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Fratkin, E. 1991. *Surviving Drought and Development: Ariaal Pastoralists of Northern Kenya*. Westview Press, Boulder.
- . 1997. Pastoralism: Governance & development issues. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26: 235–261.
- . 2001. East African pastoralism in Transition: Maasai, Boran, and Rendille Cases. *African Studies Review*, 44(3): 1–25.
- Fratkin, E., K.A. Galvin & E.A. Roth 1994. Introduction. In (E. Fratkin, K.A. Galvin & E.A. Roth, eds.) *African Pastoralist Systems: An Integrated Approach*, pp. 1–15, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London.
- Fratkin, E., M. Nathan & E.A. Roth (eds.) 2012. *Seeking Alternative Livelihoods in Northern Kenya: Costs and Benefits in Health and Nutrition*. Paper Presented at the International Conference on the Future of Pastoralism. March 21–23, 2011. Feinstein International Center of Tufts University.
- Gabaudan, M. 2012. From emergency aid to development aid: Agencies are failing to connect. *The Guardian*, January 19, 2012. Online. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2012/jan/19/humanitarian-aid-development-assistance-connect> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Galtung, J. 1969. Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6: 167–191.
- Galaty, J.G. & P.C. Salzman (eds.) 1981. *Change and Development in Nomadic and Pastoral Societies*. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Galaty, J.G., D. Anderson, P.C. Salzman & A. Chouinard (eds.) 1981. *The Future of Pastoral Peoples: Proceedings of a Conference Held in Nairobi, Kenya, 4–8 August 1980*. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa.

- Galaty, J.G. & P. Bonte (eds.) 1991. *Herders, Warriors, and Traders: Pastoralism in Africa*. Westview Press, Boulder.
- Gupta, A. & J. Ferguson (eds.) 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Duke University Press, Durham.
- Haddow, G., J. Bullock & D.P. Coppola (eds.) 2011. *Introduction to Emergency Management, Fourth Edition*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Amsterdam.
- Hardon, A., P. Boonmongkon, P. Streefland, M.L. Tan, T. Hongvivatana, S. Van der Geest, A. Van Staa, C. Varkevisser, C. Acuin, M. Chowdhury, A. Bhuiya, L. Sringeriyuang, E. Van Dongen & T. Gerrits 2001. *Applied Health Research Manual: 5. Anthropology of Health and Health Care*. Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam.
- Harrell-Bond, B.E. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hinds, R. 2015. Relationship between humanitarian and development aid. *GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report*, February 16, 2015. Online. <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/HDQ1185.pdf> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Hodgson, D.L. (ed.) 2000. *Rethinking Pastoralism in Africa: Gender, Culture & the Myth of the Patriarchal Pastoralist*. James Currey, Oxford.
- Horowitz, M. & P. Little 1987. African pastoralism and poverty: Some implications for drought and famine. In (M. Glantz, ed.) *Drought and Hunger in Africa*, pp. 59–82. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC) (ed.) 2014. *On the Margin: Kenya's Pastoralists. From Displacement to Solutions, a Conceptual Study on the Internal Displacement of Pastoralists*. Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, Genova.
- Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) 2012. *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. INEE Coordinator for Minimum Standards and Network Tools, New York.
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) 1996. *The Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent*. Geneva.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2007. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Johnson, D.H. 1981. The fighting Nuer: Primary sources and the origins of a stereotype. *Africa*, 51: 508–527.
- Johnson D. & D. Anderson (eds.) 1988. *The Ecology of Survival: Case Studies from Northeast African History*. Lester Crook Academic Publishing, London.
- Kay-Fowlow, M. 2012. Closing the Gap Between Humanitarian and Development Aid. *CIGI*, February 28, 2012. Online. <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/2012/02/closing-gap-between-humanitarian-and-development-aid> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Knowles, J.N. & D.P. Collett 1989. Nature as myth, symbol and action: Notes towards an historical understanding of development and conservation in Kenyan maasailand. *Africa*, 59(4): 433–460.
- Konaka, S. 1997. The Samburu livestock market in northcentral Kenya. *African Study Monographs*, 18(3–4): 137–155.
- 2001. The Samburu livestock trader in north-central Kenya. *Nilo-Ethiopian Studies*, 7: 63–79.
- 2006. *The Pastoral Dual Economy: An Ethnographic Study of the Samburu in Kenya*. Sekaishisoshia, Kyoto (in Japanese).
- 2007. The Minute Globalization of the Petty Commodities: The case of the Samburu utilization of the waste material in north central Kenya. In (R. Ogawa, ed.) *Anthropology of Resources Vol. 4 The Vivid World of the Small Products*, pp. 25–62, Kobundo Publishing, Tokyo (in Japanese).

- Krätli S. 2001. *Education Provision to Nomadic Pastoralists, A Literature Review*. IDS Working Paper 126, World Bank, New York.
- . 2013. Global public policy narratives on the drylands and pastoralism. *Briefing Climate Resilient Drylands Development*, April 2013.
- Krätli, S. & C. Dyer 2006. Education and development for nomads: The issues and the evidence. In (C. Dyer, ed.) *The Education of Nomadic Peoples: Current issues, future prospects*, pp. 8–34. Berghahn Books, Oxford.
- Krätli, S. & N. Schareika 2010. Living off uncertainty: The intelligent animal production of dryland pastoralists. *European Journal of Development Research*, 22(5): 605–622.
- Kratz, C.A. & R.J. Gordon 2002. Persistent popular images of pastoralists. *Visual Anthropology*, 15: 247–265.
- Lensu, M. 2003. *Respect for Culture and Customs in International Humanitarian Assistance: Implications for Principles and Policy*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Little, M.A. & P.W. Leslie 1999. *Turkana Herders of the Dry Savanna: Ecology and Biobehavioral Response of Nomads to an Uncertain Environment*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Livingstone, I. 1977. Economic irrationality among pastoral peoples: Myth or reality? *Development and Change*, 8: 209–230.
- Majok, A.A. & C.W. Schwabe 1996. *Development among Africa's Migratory Pastoralists*. Bergin & Garvey, Westport.
- Malkki, L. 1996. Speechless emissaries: Refugees, humanitarianism, and dehistoricization. *Cultural Anthropology*, 11(3): 377–404.
- Markakis, J. 2004. *Pastoralism on the Margin*. Minority Rights Group International, London.
- McCabe, J.T. 1987. Drought and recovery: Livestock dynamics among the Ngisonyoka Turkana of Kenya. *Human Ecology*, 15(4): 371–389.
- Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) n.d. *MSF Charter and Principles*. Online. <http://www.msf.org/en/msf-charter-and-principles> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Minn, P. 2007. Toward an anthropology of humanitarianism. *The Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*. August 6, 2007. Online. <https://sites.tufts.edu/jha/archives/51> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Moore, J. 2010. The humanitarian-development gap. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 833: 103–108.
- National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) 2009. *Introduction to Emergency Management*. Online. <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/EarthQuake/NEH0101220.htm> (Accessed October 1, 2015).
- Network on Humanitarian Assistance (NOHA) 1998. *Anthropology in Humanitarian Assistance, Second Edition*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.
- Nichols, B. 1987. Rubberband humanitarianism. *Ethics and International Affairs*, 1: 191–210.
- Pavanello, S. 2009. *Pastoralists' Vulnerability in the Horn of Africa: Exploring Political Marginalization, Donors' Policies, and Cross-Border Issues*. Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Prendergast, J. 1996. *Frontline Diplomacy: Humanitarian Aid and Conflict in Africa*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.
- Roe, E. 1991. Development narratives, or making the best of blueprint development. *World Development*, 19(4): 287–300.
- Roe, E., L. Huntsinger & K. Labnow 1998. High-reliability pastoralism versus risk-averse pastoralism. *Journal of Environment and Development*, 7(4): 387–421.
- Raikes, P.L. 1981. *Livestock Development and Policy in East Africa*. Scandinavian Institute of

- African Studies, Uppsala.
- Roth, E. A. & E. Fratkin 2005. Introduction: The social, health, and economic consequences of pastoral sedenterization in Marsabit District, Northern Kenya. In (E. Fratkin & E.A. Roth, eds.) *As Pastoralists Settle: Social, Health, and Economic Consequences of Pastoral Sedentarization in Marsabit District, Kenya*, pp. 1–28, Kluwer Academic Publisher, New York.
- Sandford S. 1983. *Management of Pastoral Development in the Third World*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
- Scoones, I. (ed.) 1995. *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Scudder, T. & E. Colson 1982. From welfare to development: A conceptual framework for the analysis of dislocated people. In (A. Hansen & A. Oliver-Smith, eds.) *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People*, pp. 267–287, Westview Press, Boulder.
- Spencer, P. 1998. *The Pastoral Continuum: The Marginalization of Tradition in East Africa*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Sphere Project 2011. *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response*. Hobbs the Printers, Hampshire.
- Straight, B. 2009. Making sense of violence in the “badlands” of Kenya, *Anthropology & Humanism*, 34(1): 21–30.
- Sun, X. 2005. Dynamics of continuity and changes of pastoral subsistence among the Rendille in northern Kenya: With special reference to livestock management and response to socio-economic changes. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 31: 1–94.
- Swift, J. 1996. Desertification narratives, winners and losers. In (M. Leach & R. Mearns, eds.) *The Lie of the Land: Challenging Received Wisdom on the African Environment*, pp. 73–90. James Currey, London.
- Terry, F. 2002. *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

————— Accepted December 22, 2016

Author's Name and Address: Shinya KONAKA, *School of International Relations, University of Shizuoka, 52-1 Yada, Suruga-ku, Shizuoka-shi, Shizuoka 422-8526, JAPAN.*
 E-mail: konaka [at] u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp